From: Stuart Gedal
To: Kelley, Craig
Subject: From Stuart Gedal: PLEASE VOTE NO ON ONE-SIDED BOYCOTT RESOLUTION
Date: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:27:04 PM

Hi, Craig-

I've been doing my civic duty-gathered information and written all but one of the other Councilors. I have concerns for sure about procedure (Thursday 5:30pm filing of a resolution would leave 2 business days—tomorrow and Monday—for constituents or Councilors to plan a sane way to confer/discuss and then debate/vote.

Looking back, too, on the evolution of social justice-related resolutions by the Council (back to the early 1980s) I have another concern: proposed/apparent wording of the HP Boycott Resolution isn't really a "fit" with the precedent resolutions about social justice issues. We could talk about or exchange e-mails about the details of this if you'd like.

How did your meetings with pro/con groups or individuals go? Can you share the groups, if any, who were represented? Have you learned anything specific regarding the wording that will be proposed? If you have not yet met with the "cons" or are bringing the two groups together, and there is room for an individual constituent rather than an organization, I would be interested in participating.

WHAT I THINK SHOULD HAPPEN

Having sorted out the information that I have about this, and "processed" it to present in several e-mails, I now have an opinion about the resolution and preference for how the Council should react to it.

The resolution should be diverted from the floor to allow time for Councilors to address the issue of "fit" in terms of the Council's duties and the lack of precedents for it. If it is a fit and comes back to the floor, the council should allow a hearing (maybe something like 5 speakers from both sides so it doesn't go all night) and a vote a few weeks following.

At worst, in my mind, this creates enough time for better thinking and interaction between meetings. There needs to be a much better feeling about how the Council is handling this either way. There's lots going around—true our not—about how this is being rammed through.

If things are slowed down, I think many people will come forward to work on re-wording the resolution—enough to get that accomplished. Added to people concerned about the singling out of Israel and legal people concerned about a "Secondary Boycott", people concerned about the safety of prison personnel, students in school buildings, or federal facilities like the Post Office across from City Hall, etc., will react to the condemnation of the sale/purchase of any HP surveillance products.

I hope that creating more time for public discussion and involving people with broader interests will dissipate some of the misdirected anti-Israel and even anti-Jewish energy that is going into this whole discussion. Less likely, I suppose, is that the HP Boycott will withdraw rather than take out the reference to the Middle East or prisons or immigration and look for other cities and towns to target.

Thank you again for your time.

Best,
Stuart

Sent from my iPad